

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-11 and 13-15 are amended and new claims 17-40 are added. Claims 1-40 are pending and under consideration.

BACKGROUND

An interview was conducted on March 2, 2004 with the Examiner. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview. The substance of the interview included discussion of claims 1-16. The Examiner also suggested the Applicant consider addition of new claims reciting a feature of "writing."

A Response (Prior Response) to the Final Office Action (Action) was filed March 4, 2004. An Advisory Action was mailed March 16, 2004.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1 and 9, and claims 5 and 13, are amended to recite, respectively, a coordinate detection device, and a method, include calculating a distance between coordinate values of previous and current input operations. (See, for example, FIGs. 9A and 9B and page 22, starting at line 1).

Claims 2 and 10, and claims 6 and 14, are amended to recite, respectively, a coordinate detection, and a method, include determining an operation mode as a relative mode or an absolute mode. (See, for example, page 12, starting at line 12).

Claims 3 and 11, and claim 7, are amended to recite, respectively, a determination unit, and a method, include determining an operation mode of an input unit based on a relative contact area formed by a contact of the input device with the surface of the input unit. Claim 14 is amended to recite determining based on a relative area of contact of the inputting. (See, for example, FIGs. 4A and 4B, and page 11, starting at line 1).

Dependent claims 4 and 8 are amended to correspond with parent claims 1 and 5 respectively.

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 17-40 present no new matter and are provided to afford a varying scope of protection.

New claims 17-20 recite a writing device including an input unit, having a surface thereof, to which a coordinate value is input by an input device and a calculation unit calculating a distance between coordinate values of previous and current input operations by the input unit.

(See, for example, FIG. 3 and FIGS. 10A and 10B, and pages 22-23, starting at line 15).

New claims 21-24 recite a method of detecting coordinates of a writing character, including inputting a coordinate value of a writing character to a surface of an input unit, by an input device and calculating a difference in distance between coordinate values of a previous and a current input. (See, for example, FIG. 8, and pages 18-19, starting at line 31).

New claims 25-28 recite a writing device, including an input unit, having a surface thereof, to which a coordinate value of a writing character is input and a calculator calculating a distance between a coordinate value of a first input operation and a coordinate value of a second input operation. (See, for example, FIG. 3 and FIGS. 10A and 10B, pages 22-23, starting at line 15).

New claims 29-32, and new claims 37-40 recite, respectively, a method of detecting coordinates of a writing character, and, including inputting at least one coordinate value of the writing character to a surface of an input unit and setting a coordinate value of a first inputting as the final coordinate value input of the first inputting if a second inputting has not occurred for a predetermined time. (See, for example, FIG. 8, and pages 18-19, starting at line 31).

New claims 33-34 recite a computer-readable recording medium that stores a method of detecting coordinates including inputting a coordinate value to a surface of an input unit. (See, for example, FIG. 8, and pages 18-19, starting at line 31).

TRAVERSE OF SUBSTANTIVE REJECTIONS

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections on the bases of the prior response and as follows.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, AND 13-15 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 BY HIRAYAMA ET AL. (U.S.P. 5,406,307)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-15 are rejected for obviousness over Hirayama et al. In the prior response, Applicant submitted that *prima facie* obviousness was not established since features of the claims were not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Calculating A Distance Between Coordinate Values Of Previous And Current Input Operations Not Taught Or Obvious

Applicant submitted that calculating a difference between coordinate values is one of the features recited in the present applications independent claims that is not described in Hirayama. (Prior Response at page 5). The Examiner contended that claims do not "specifically recite that the difference ... is the difference in distance." (Action at page 5)

While the Applicant submits that it is understood by those in the art that a "calculating" describes more than a mere comparison, independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 (all as amended) recite calculating a distance between coordinate values of a previous and a current input operation.

Determining An Operation Mode As A Relative Mode Or An Absolute Mode And Setting Based On Determination Result Not Taught Or Obvious

Applicant submitted that determining an operation mode and setting based on the result is not taught by the cited art. (Prior Response at pages 6-7). The Examiner contends that in Hirayama FIG. 4A that when:

the device changes the mode either moving the enlarged icon (step S8) or step S9 whereat the icon is activated (Col. 6, lines 3-21) which fairly reads on the changing of the operation mode.

(Action at page 3).

While Applicant submits the Examiner's contention does not apply to operation modes as defined within the present application, claims 2, 6, 10, and 14 (all as amended) recite determining an operation mode as a relative mode or an absolute mode.

Determination Based On Relative Contact Area Not Taught

Applicant submitted that determining an operation mode based on a contact area was not taught by Hirayama, since the cited art only describes a single contact pen mechanism. (Prior Response at page 7). At the interview, the Examiner contended that since Hirayama describes a pen, a determination is made upon that single pen contact.

While Applicant submits that Hirayama does not teach any determination based on a size of pen contact area, claims 3, 7, 11, and 14 (all as amended) recite determining based on a relative contact area.

Summary

Since *prima facie* obviousness has not been established, the rejections should be withdrawn and claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that all claims patentably distinguish over the prior art, taken alone or in any proper combination.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Preliminary Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 5, 2004

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501